

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 22 and 29 have been amended. Claim 31 is canceled. Claims 1-29 are pending and under consideration.

The rejection under 35 USC 112 is overcome by the present amendments.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are now discussed. Using independent claim 1 as an example, this claim recites the EDID comprising capable setting information related to capabilities of the display apparatus, wherein the display setting adjustment window comprises a plurality of setting buttons corresponding to the display setting; and activating one of the setting buttons according to the capable setting information of the EDID.

Support for these features is found, for example, in present paragraph 68. Paragraph 68 uses resolution as an example, and thus, this display setting will be used for purposes of the discussion herein, but should not be construed as limiting the scope of the claims. According to present paragraph 68, the EDID is read, and resolutions that may be used by the display are determined. The buttons corresponding to these capable resolutions are then displayed. Buttons corresponding to other resolutions are not displayed.

These features are somewhat similar to those recited in claim 31 (now cancelled), which was rejected based upon Ross. However, this reference still displays resolutions that are not supported. Specifically, all of the resolutions are displayed and resolutions beyond the capability of the monitor are indicated as "not supported". Ross, FIG. 4. Also, resolutions that are not supported will be dimmed. Ross, column 4, line 56.

The invention of claim 1 is advantageous as compared to Ross because according to the invention of claim 1, the user cannot operate the display in an inappropriate manner. This is because the user cannot activate a button when this button is not displayed. In contrast, Ross allows for the possibility that the user will try to use an inappropriate setting, thereby consuming the user's time unnecessarily. Furthermore, users who are foreign to the displayed language or not familiar with computers may not understand the term "not supported". Still further, certain users with vision impairments may not be able to distinguish the dimmed lettering from the normal lettering. As such, the display of Ross is less convenient for a user. Furthermore, Ross is unnecessarily confusing and distracting due to the presentation of unnecessary information.

The remaining references do not overcome these deficiencies in Ross, and are not relied upon to do so. Independent claims 22 and 29 are patentable over the cited references at least for similar reasons as discussed with respect to Ross.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4-19-2010

By:   
Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501